arXiv:1607.00065v1 [hep-ph] 30 Jun 2016

Sensitivities to charged-current nonstandard neutrino interactions at DUNE

Pouya Bakhti[1] and Amir N. Khan[2]

[1]*School of Physics, Institute for research in fundamental sciences (IPM), PO Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran*

[2]*School of Physics, Sun Yat-Sen University (SYSU), Guangzhou, 510275, China*[*]

Abstract

We investigate the effects of charged-current nonstandard neutrino interactions (NSIs) at the source and at the detector in the simulated data for the planned Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE), while neglecting the neutral-current NSIs at the propagation. We study the effects of NSIs on the simultaneous measurements of θ_{23} and δ_{CP} in the DUNE. The analysis reveals that 3σ C.L. measurement of the correct octant of θ_{23} in the standard mixing scenario is spoiled if NSIs are taken into account. Likewise, the NSIs can deteriorate the uncertainty of the δ_{CP} measurement by a factor of two relative to that in the standard oscillation scenario. We further show that the source and the detector NSIs can induce a significant amount of fake CP-violation and the no fake CP-violation case can be excluded by more than 99% C.L. We also find the potential of DUNE to constrain the relevant charged-current NSI parameters from the single parameter fits for both neutrino and antineutrino appearance and disappearance channels at both the near and far detectors. The results show that there could be improvement in the current bounds by a factor of two at the far detector of DUNE, while one order of magnitude improvement at the near detector.

[*] pouya_bakhti@ipm.ir, khan8@mail.sysu.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the nonzero value of neutrino mixing angle θ_{13} has revolutionized the field of neutrinos physics in the recent years. This has been made possible after the twenty years long efforts to build and improve the sophisticated detector technology for the measurement of the small value of θ_{13} in the accelerator neutrino experiment, T2K [1] and the reactor neutrino experiments, Double Chooz [2], RENO [3] and Daya Bay [4]. These experiments have measured the value of θ_{13} with unprecedented precision. The next goals in the neutrino oscillation study is to find the correct ordering of the neutrino mass hierarchy (Normal or Inverted), the determination of the CP-violating phase (δ_{CP}), to find the correct octant of the mixing parameter θ_{23} and the precise measurements of all the parameters of the neutrino oscillation scheme. All these unknown parameters and the information will be explored in the medium-baseline reactor neutrino oscillation experiments, JUNO [5] and RENO-50 [6], and in the long baseline accelerator experiments, T2K [7], NOνA [8], T2HK [9] and the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE) [10].

Two main goals out of the several others in the ongoing DUNE are the measurement of δ_{CP} and determination of the correct octant of θ_{23}. The apparent issue in the simultaneous measurement of these two parameters is their strong correlation with each other. In Ref. [11], it has been shown that in $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e$ appearance channels the simultaneous measurement of θ_{23} and δ_{CP} in the long baseline experiments in the region $40^\circ \leq \theta_{23} \leq 50^\circ$ is the better way to measure the two parameters more precisely. The same authors have studied the correlation and their impacts on the measurement of the two parameters by considering both the appearance and disappearance channels at the long baseline experiments, T2HK [12], LBNE [13], IDS-NF [14] and ESSνSB [15] with different baselines [16]. It has been shown that how the interplay between the two channels can improve the measurements of θ_{23} and δ_{CP} and how the existing degeneracy can be lifted.

In the recent years, after the discovery of the nonzero value of θ_{13}, a wide effort has been put to investigate the hints for NSIs at the neutrino sources and detectors in the reactor short-baseline experiments [17–21] and for the NSIs at propagation in the accelerator long baseline experiments [22–25]. For instance, in Ref. [22], it has been shown that how the data from DUNE setup can be modified in the presence of different scenarios of NSIs at propagation of magnitude larger than O(10^{-1}) if the DUNE data is not consistent with the standard paradigm. It has been shown in Ref. [23] that the degeneracy between the standard mixing parameters and NSI parameters at propagation of the appearance channels in the three long baseline neutrino oscillation experiments T2K, NOνA and DUNE have been studied. The authors of Ref. [23] found that at a single L/E_ν, both diagonal and off-diagonal NSI parameters can lead to the four-fold degeneracy that can affect the measurement of mass hierarchy, octant of θ_{23} and δ_{CP} measurements. It has been shown that this degeneracy cannot be resolved even by the combined data of T2K and NOνA, however a wide-band beam experiment like DUNE can resolve the degeneracy in some scenarios, but not for the others. In Ref. [26], it has been shown a low energy neutrino oscillation experiment such as MOMENT [27] can also resolve this degeneracy. In Ref. [24], it has been shown for appearance and disappearance channels that how the degeneracies among different NSI

parameters with each other and with the standard mixing parameter θ_{23} can hinder the measurement goals of DUNE and T2HK experiment.

In this work, we take an alternative approach by considering the charged-current (CC) NSIs which can affect the neutrino production and detection for the case of DUNE. We neglect the neutral-current (NC) NSIs which is important for propagation in matter [28]. We first analyze the low-level information at probability and at event rate spectrum level and then perform the full statistical analysis to find the sensitivity of DUNE measurements to CC NSIs at the source and at the detector. We explore the correlation between the two standard parameters θ_{23} and δ_{CP} in the presence of CC NSIs. Analysis with the same goals, but for the different baseline at the ESSνSB facility [15] has been carried out in Ref. [29], where it has been shown that the precision of θ_{23} is robust in the presence of source and detector NSIs, but δ_{CP} measurement gets worsen. We find the effects of the CP-violation arising due the NSI phases when the standard $\delta_{CP} = 0$; we called it the fake CP-violation and denote it by δ'_{CP}. Further, we explore the potential of DUNE to constrain the CC NSI parameters at the neutrino source and at the detector and compare them with the current bounds.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we present the CC effective four-Fermion NSI Lagrangians relevant for the DUNE study and illustrate oscillation probability formulas along with the NSI effects. In section III, we discuss about the characteristics of DUNE and details of our analysis. We present our results and discussion in section IV. The summary and conclusions to this work is given in section V.

II. FORMALISM AND NOTATIONS

In this section, we give details of the formalism we developed for the study of source and detector NSIs at DUNE. We discuss the formalism at the Lagrangian and probabilities level, here.

A. Effective NSI Lagrangians For DUNE

For the DUNE setup, high energy beams (up to 10GeV) of neutrino and antineutrinos are produced at the accelerator as a result of pion decays ($\pi^- \to \mu^- + \overline{\nu}_\alpha$ and $\pi^- \to \mu^- + \nu_\alpha$) and after that through muon decays ($\mu^- \to e^- \overline{\nu}_\alpha \nu_\beta$ and $\mu^+ \to e^+ \nu_\alpha \overline{\nu}_\beta$). They travel over a distances of 1300km towards the detector and their detection is made through inverse beta decays ($\nu_\alpha n \to p e^-$ and $\overline{\nu}_\alpha p \to n e^+$) in the liquid argon scintillation detector. We can classify the NSI Lagrangians for all of these processes into two types; semileptonic and purely leptonic. Therefore, the left-handed four-Fermion CC effective NSI Lagrangian which governs the pion decays at the source and the inverse beta decays at the detector are given by [19]

$$\mathcal{L}^S = -2\sqrt{2} G_F \sum_\beta (\delta_{\mu\beta} + \varepsilon^{udL}_{\alpha\beta})(\overline{\mu}\gamma_\lambda P_L U_{\beta a}\nu_a)(\bar{d}\gamma^\lambda P_L u)^\dagger + h.c., \tag{1}$$

while for the muon decay channels at the neutrino source, the left-handed four-Fermion CC effective NSI Lagrangian is given as

$$\mathcal{L}^L = -2\sqrt{2}G_F \sum_{\alpha,\beta}(\delta_{\alpha\beta} + \varepsilon^L_{\alpha\beta})(\overline{e}\gamma_\lambda P_L U_{\alpha a}\nu_a)(\overline{\mu}\gamma^\lambda P_L U_{\beta b}\nu_b)^\dagger \tag{2}$$

where the superscripts "S" and "L" on left-hand side denote semileptonic and leptonic, respectively, α, β are the flavor indices and a, b are mass indices. We have restricted ourselves to the case of left-handed neutrino helicity and vector and axial-vector quark currents. For simplicity, we do not consider any right-handed NSI couplings. The coefficients $\varepsilon^{udL}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\varepsilon^L_{\alpha\beta}$, which are complex in general, are the relative coupling strengths of the different flavor combinations of NSIs to the standard model semileptonic and leptonic case, respectively, while in the SM case both $\varepsilon^{udL}_{\alpha\beta} = \varepsilon^L_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. For the sake of completeness, we have considered the NSI effects in the muon decay, however we will not include them in our calculations because of their negligibly small contributions (less than 1% in comparison with NSIs in the pion and inverse beta decays.)

It is obvious from the Lagrangian in Eq. 1 that source and detector NSIs can be incorporated in the amplitude for the neutrino oscillations by the effective replacement $U_{\alpha a} \rightarrow (\delta_{\mu\beta} + \varepsilon^{udL}_{\alpha\beta})U_{\alpha a}$, where the oscillation amplitude for the neutrino produced with flavor α and detected with the flavor β modifies the standard amplitude as

$$A_{\alpha\beta} = U^*_{\alpha a}\exp[(-m_a^2+a_{cc})L/2E_\nu]U_{\beta a} \rightarrow (\delta_{\mu\beta}+\varepsilon^{s*}_{\alpha\beta})U^*_{\alpha a}\exp[(-m_a^2+a_{cc})L/2E_\nu](\delta_{\mu\beta}+\varepsilon^d_{\alpha\beta})U_{\beta a}$$

where m_a are the neutrinos mass eigenvalues, L is the baseline and E_ν is the neutrino energy. The repeated indices are summed over. For simplicity, we have replaced $\varepsilon^{udL}_{\alpha\beta}$ by $\varepsilon^s_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\varepsilon^d_{\alpha\beta}$ at source and the detector, respectively. We also corrected the propagation factor by the standard matter effects by the matter potential $a_{cc} = 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e E_\nu$. Similarly, for the antineutrino case, the oscillation amplitude will be as

$$\overline{A}_{\alpha\beta} = U_{\alpha a}\exp[(-m_a^2+a_{cc})L/2E_\nu]U^*_{\beta a} \rightarrow (\delta_{\mu\beta}+\varepsilon^s_{\alpha\beta})U_{\alpha a}\exp[(-m_a^2+a_{cc})L/2E_\nu](\delta_{\mu\beta}+\varepsilon^{d*}_{\alpha\beta})U^*_{\beta a}.$$

With the effective NSI Lagrangian defined and the necessary amplitude developed we can get the neutrinos oscillation probabilities in general by $P_{\alpha\beta} = |A_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ and similary for antineutrinos, $\overline{P}_{\alpha\beta} = |\overline{A}_{\alpha\beta}|^2$. We are now ready to summarize the neutrino oscillation probabilities and the accelerator neutrino flux needed for quantifying the NSIs effects at the source and detector. Notice, we do not consider the NC NSIs which affect neutrino propagation in matter [28]. Refs. [30, 31] introduced some models responsible for NC NSIs.

B. Oscillation Probabilities with NSIs at DUNE

For neutrino oscillation probabilities we will rely on the formulas derived using perturbative approximations in Ref. [32]. We will recap all of the oscillation probability formulas related to DUNE and will give description of how and which of the relevant source and detector CC NSI parameters are important for the near and far detectors of DUNE. In the following, we discuss them separately about the near and far detectors.

1. Oscillation Probabilities at Near Detector

As described above, we consider two modes of oscillations, disappearance of $\nu_\mu/\overline{\nu}_e$ and appearance of $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e$ at both the near and far detectors. At the near detector, the $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e$ appearance probability with standard interactions is zero because of the negligibly small oscillation effects due to solar and atmospheric mass-splittings. However, in the presence of CC flavor-violating NSIs in pion decay, some $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e s$ can be produced and be survived and detected at the near detector. The NSI effective coupling strength for these interactions at the source and at the detectors are $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$, respectively. At the near detector, the effective oscillation probability of $\nu_e$appearance can be calculated as [32],

$$P^{\rm ND}_{\nu^s_\mu \to \nu^d_e} \simeq |\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|^2 + |\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|^2 + 2|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}||\epsilon^d_{\mu e}| \cos(\phi^s_{\mu e} - \phi^d_{\mu e}). \tag{3}$$

which is the approximate perturbative formula depending only on the NSI parameters. For $\overline{\nu}_e$ the sign of the NSI phases flip.

Similarly for the disappearance of the ν_μ and $\overline{\nu}_\mu$ with negligibly effects due the standard oscillations the approximate, perturbative survival probability in the presence of the CC NSIs at the source and detector is given by [32]

$$P^{\rm ND}_{\nu^s_\mu \to \nu^d_\mu} \simeq 1 + 2|\epsilon^s_{\mu\mu}| \cos\phi^s_{\mu\mu} + 2|\epsilon^d_{\mu\mu}| \cos\phi^d_{\mu\mu}, \tag{4}$$

which depends only the nonuniversal CC NSI parameters $\epsilon^s_{\mu\mu}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\mu\mu}$ at the source and at the detector, respectively. This also leads to the excess of events at near detector. $P^{\rm ND}_{\overline{\nu}^s_\mu \to \overline{\nu}^d_\mu}$ is similar to Eq. 4, with different sign of phases. Constraining these parameters in the near detector depend on the precision of the pion and muon fluxes [33, 34], which is the main purpose of the near detector to determine the neutrino flux with as much precision as possible.

In Eq. 4 and 3, the oscillation probabilities are constant with constant values of the NSI parameters since they neither depend on the standard oscillation parameters and nor on the neutrino energies, thus both probabilities are equal to constants. Notice, the value of $P^{\rm ND}_{\nu^s_\mu \to \nu^d_\mu}$ from Eq. 4 and also $P^{\rm ND}_{\overline{\nu}^s_\mu \to \overline{\nu}^d_\mu}$ can be more than one due to the existence of NSIs. Moreover, if $\phi^s_{\mu\mu}$ or $\phi^d_{\mu\mu}$ are equal to 90° or 270°, the corresponding $|\epsilon|$ can not be constrained by the near detector.

In the $\pi^\pm$-decays, a small ratio of $e^\pm, \nu_e$ and $\overline{\nu}_e$ are also produced with the branching ratio of $O(10^{-4})$, so in the presence of NSIs, the production rate will be greater than the standard model expectations. This will lead to the excess in the survival probabilities of the disappearance of ν_e and $\overline{\nu}_e$ at the near detector. Likewise, in the presence of NSIs, the ν_e and $\overline{\nu}_e$ cross sections at the detector will also be affected as a result of NSIs. The approximate perturbative survival probability of the $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e$with negligible effects of the standard oscillations in the presence of the CC NSIs at the source and detector is given by [32],

$$P^{\rm ND}_{\nu^s_e \to \nu^d_e} = 1 + 2|\epsilon^s_{ee}| \cos\phi^s_{ee} + 2|\epsilon^d_{ee}| \cos\phi^d_{ee}, \tag{5}$$

where the two nonuniversal NSI parameters $\epsilon^s_{ee}$and ϵ^d_{ee} are responsible for the oscillation probability greater than one.

Notice that the appearance probabilities, $P_{\nu_\mu^s \to \nu_e^d}$, in Eq. 3 and the disappearance probability in Eq. 5, $P_{\nu_e^s \to \nu_e^d}$, can give identical signals at the near detector which leads to the degeneracy effect among the parameter space of ϵ_{ee}^s, ϵ_{ee}^d, $\epsilon_{\mu e}^s$ and $\epsilon_{\mu e}^d$.

2. Oscillation Probabilities at Far Detector

At the far detector of DUNE, NSI matter effects can be of most interest as they can induce stronger degeneracies to the determination of δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23} as shown Refs. [22–24]. However, to study the pure CC NSIs at the neutrino sources and detectors we ignore the NSIs effects at propagation which can reduce the complexity to study the purely CC NSI effects in the measurements at DUNE. To have the idea of which CC NSI parameters are relevant at the far detector we review both the disappearance and the appearance oscillation probability formulas for both ν_μ and $\overline{\nu}_\mu$ flavors. We apply some necessary approximations to get more compact forms of these formulas.

In case of the muon disappearance, oscillation probability formula with CC and NC NSIs obtained with the perturbative approximations, along with the maximal mixing approximation of $\theta_{23} \simeq 45^o$, and with assuming $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^s \simeq \epsilon_{\tau\mu}^d \equiv \epsilon_{\tau\mu}$ and $\epsilon_{\mu\mu}^s \simeq \epsilon_{\mu\mu}^d \equiv \epsilon_{\mu\mu}$, in Ref. [32] is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu} \simeq\ & (1 + 4|\epsilon_{\mu\mu}| \cos\phi_{\mu\mu}) \left(1 - \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}\right) \\
& + \left[2|\epsilon_{\mu\tau}| \sin\phi_{\mu\tau} - |\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^m| \cos\phi_{\mu\tau}^m \frac{a_{\rm CC} L}{2E}\right] \sin\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
& - 2c_{2\times 23}|\epsilon_{\mu\tau}| \cos\phi_{\mu\tau} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} c_{2\times 23}|\epsilon_{\mu\mu}^m| \left[\frac{a_{\rm CC} L}{2E} \sin\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 4\frac{a_{\rm CC}}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}\right] \\
& - \frac{1}{2} c_{2\times 23}|\epsilon_{\tau\tau}^m| \left[\frac{a_{\rm CC} L}{2E} \sin\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 4\frac{a_{\rm CC}}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}\right], \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $c_{2\times 23} \equiv \cos(2\theta_{23})$. By neglecting $\cos(2\theta_{23})$, disappearance probability will be more simplified, which only depends on the NSI parameters $\epsilon_{\mu\mu}$, $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}$ and $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^m$. Notice, $\epsilon_{\mu\mu}$ does not change the oscillation pattern of the flavour change and its effect is similar to changing the flux, thus it has a correlation with flux uncertainty. Also, there is degeneracy between $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}$ and $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^m$. This degeneracy can be studied by combining DUNE with another experiment with lower neutrino energy such as MOMENT [27] or T2HK [9]. With lower neutrino energy, a_{CC} will be lower or matter effects in both the standard and nonstandard case have a smaller impact on oscillation. In this work, we neglect NSIs matter effect and $\epsilon_{\mu\mu}$ and $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}$ are the only NSI parameters that have effect on muon neutrino disappearance channel in our case. Likewise, for the case of $\overline{\nu}_\mu$, the sign of δ_{cp}, a_{cc} and NSI phase should changed in Eq. 6.

Like the appearance of the $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e$ at the near detector, the appearance oscillation probabilities at far detector also depend on $\epsilon_{\mu e}^s$ and $\epsilon_{\mu e}^d$. In a long baseline experiment, due to muon neutrino oscillation to tau neutrino, a large amount of $\nu_\tau/\overline{\nu}_\tau$ can reach to the detector.

Thus, considering an NSI which produce e^-/e^+ from $\nu_\tau/\overline{\nu}_\tau$ interaction will give an excess e^-/e^+ due NSIs. Similar signals could be obtained from the $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ parameter and $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ parameters, which shows a stong degeneracy among the these NSIs parameters. $\nu_e/\overline{\nu}_e$ appearance channel is also sensitive to δ_{CP}, therefore, we can investigate the potential of parameters $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ to see the induced fake CP-violation due to the NSI phases. The ν_e appearance probability, with maximal mixing approximation $\theta_{23} \simeq 45^o$, in the presence of CC NSIs can be written as [32]

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{\nu^s_\mu \to \nu^d_e} &= 2\tilde{s}^2_{13}\sin^2(\Delta_{31}-A_{CC}) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\Delta_{21}}{A_{CC}}\Big)^2 s^2_{2\times 12}\sin^2 A_{CC} \\
&- \Bigg[s_{2\times 12}\frac{\Delta_{21}}{A_{CC}}\left(\tilde{s}_{13}\cos\delta_{\rm CP} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\left(|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|\cos\phi^d_{\mu e} + |\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|\cos\phi^d_{\tau e}\right)\right) + \sqrt{2}|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|\tilde{s}_{13}\cos(\phi^d_{\mu e}+\delta_{\rm CP}) \\
&- \sqrt{2}|\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|\tilde{s}_{13}\cos(\phi^d_{\tau e}+\delta_{\rm CP})\Bigg] . \left[\sin^2 A_{CC} - \sin^2\Delta_{31} + \sin^2(\Delta_{31}-A_{CC})\right] \\
&+ \Bigg[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\Delta_{21}}{A_{CC}} s_{2\times 12}\left(\tilde{s}_{13}\sin\delta_{\rm CP} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\left(|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|\sin\phi^d_{\mu e} - |\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|\sin\phi^d_{\tau e}\right)\right) + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|\tilde{s}_{13}\sin(\phi^d_{\mu e}+\delta_{\rm CP}) \\
&- \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|\tilde{s}_{13}\sin(\phi^d_{\tau e}+\delta_{\rm CP})\Bigg] . \left[\sin 2A_{CC} - \sin 2\Delta_{31} + \sin 2(\Delta_{31}-A_{CC})\right] \\
&- \sqrt{2}|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|\tilde{s}_{13}\left[2\cos(\phi^s_{\mu e}+\delta_{\rm CP})\sin^2(\Delta_{31}-A_{CC}) - \sqrt{2}|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|\tilde{s}_{13}\sin(\phi^s_{\mu e}+\delta_{\rm CP})\sin 2(\Delta_{31}-A_{CC})\right] \\
&+ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|\frac{\Delta_{21}}{A_{CC}}\left[2 s_{2\times 12}\cos\phi^s_{\mu e}\sin^2 A_{CC} - s_{2\times 12}\sin\phi^s_{\mu e}\sin 2A_{CC}\right] . \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}
$$

where,

$$\Delta_{ij} \equiv \frac{\Delta m^2_{ij} L}{4E}, A_{CC} \equiv \frac{a_{CC} L}{4E}, \tilde{s}_{13} \equiv \frac{\Delta m^2_{21}}{\Delta m^2_{31} - a_{\rm CC}} s_{13}.$$

It is worth to mention that we do not use any of Eq. 3 to 7 in our analysis. For the analysis we use General Long Baseline Experiment Simulator(GLoBES) [42, 43]. For including the NSI effect we used [32, 44].

As a first exercise to see the effects of CC NSIs on the oscillation probabilities at the far detector of the DUNE with baseline of 1300 km are shown in Fig. 1. In Fig 1-a the electron neutrino appearance probability is shown for the standard interaction and NSIs when only one of the NSI parameters is nonzero and is equal to 0.1. In Fig. 1-b the disappearance of the muon neutrino is shown. The oscillation parameters were taken from nu-fit [36, 37] and $\delta_{CP} = 0$. The resolution of the plot in the energy axis is 0.1 MeV.

III. ANALYSIS AND DETAILS AT DUNE

In this section first we discuss the characteristic of DUNE which we consider in our simulation and then we discuss about the details of our analysis.



(a) (b)

FIG. 1. Oscillation probability for the DUNE for muon neutrino disappearance and electron neutrino appearance. The oscillation parameters are taken from nu-fit [36, 37] and $\delta_{CP} = 0$. For NSIs curves, only value of one NSI parameters considered to be nonzero and equal to 0.1. The value of all the phases are set equal to zero.

A. Characteristics of DUNE

Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE) will be a long baseline accelerator based neutrino oscillation experiment where neutrinos will be produced at FermiLab and will be detected at Sanford Underground Research Facility (SURF), 800 miles or 1300 km far from FermiLab. We consider 1.2 MW proton beam which produces neutrino and anti-neutrino beam from pion decay. The neutrino energy range is from 100 MeV to 20 GeV, with the peak around 3 GeV. We take the spectrum from [35], and consider the reference beam for the near and far detector in neutrino and anti-neutrino modes. We consider 3 years of data taking in each mode. We consider a Liquid Argon Time-Projection Chamber (LArTPC) with 34 kton fiducial mass for the far detector. The details of the near detector are under decision, however, we consider a near detector with 5 ton fiducial mass placed at 460 m baseline. We consider both appearance and disappearance modes. NC events, lepton flavor misidentification and intrinsic background are the main sources of background. We neglect other sources of background.

We consider $15\%/\sqrt{E(GeV)}$ and $20\%/\sqrt{E(GeV)}$ energy resolution for CC detection of electron neutrino and muon neutrino respectively. The efficiency of CC detection of electron and muon neutrino is 80% and 85% respectively. The NC misidentification rate is 1%. Lepton flavor misidentification is 1%. The flux uncertainty is 5% and the calibration error is 2%. The flux uncertainty of background is 10%. We take the detector performance from table 4.2 of Ref. [34]. For the analysis, we consider the energy range between 0.25 GeV to 8 GeV and 31 bins which range of each bin is 0.25 GeV. The CC and NC cross sections are taken from [45, 46]. The number of events of each bin for standard three neutrino oscillation in near and far detector are shown in Fig. 2. The number of events is aggregate of both signal

and background. Number of events of signal and background are not shown here separately. In near detector appearance mode, almost all of the events are background events since the number of events of the signal is negligible. The values of oscillation parameters are taken from nu-fit [36, 37]. The value of CP phase is considered equal to zero. For matter density profile, we use PREM with 5% uncertainties [41]. For the uncertainties of oscillation parameters, we used nu-fit result [36, 37]. Our number of events for near and far detector are in agreement with the result of Ref. [22, 38]. The difference between our result with theirs originate from the differences of neutrino flux, uncertainties, oscillation parameters such as δ_{CP} and etc. For the result of the near detector, in comparison with Ref. [38], we consider baseline of the near detector equal to 460 m, while they consider 595 m, which for comparison of these two number of events the difference of baselines has to be considered. Moreover, our number of events include both signal and background while theirs only included signal.

For simulation of DUNE and statistical inference, we used GloBES software [42, 43]. For considering the NSIs, we include the code from Ref. [32, 44]. We consider the uncertainties of source and detector NSIs from [39].

B. Details of our analysis

In our analysis, we consider two different cases. First, we explore the effect of source and detector NSIs on determination of oscillation parameters. Second, we explore the potential of near and far detectors of DUNE for constraining NSIs source and detector parameters. The main goal of DUNE is the determination of the δ_{CP} and the correct octant of θ_{23}. Therefore, we explore the effect of NSIs on determination of these two. In order to avoid complications and emphasize on the main goal of our analysis, that is, the correlation between δ_{CP} and θ_{23} in the presence of NSIs. We consider the mass ordering is known and normal. Considering NC NSIs causes degeneracies that have an effect on determination of mass ordering by both medium baseline reactor experiment such as JUNO and RENO-50 and long baseline accelerator based neutrino oscillation experiment such as DUNE, which mass ordering cannot be determined [25, 40]. However we do not consider NC NSIs.

To investigate the effect of source and detector NSIs on determination of δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23}, we do as follows. We take the value and uncertainty of oscillation parameters from nu-fit [37]. For the value of δ_{CP}, we considered two cases. First, we consider $\delta_{CP} = 0$ which corresponds to no CP-violation in neutrino oscillation and second we consider $\delta_{CP} = 270°$, which corresponds with maximal CP-violation and it is approximately equal to best point fit of δ_{CP} from nu-fit [37]. We assume all the source and detector NSI parameters equal to zero. Then we explore the DUNE potential on determination of both δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23}, by considering the standard oscillation scenario as the true one and only marginalized over standard oscillation parameters. Then by considering the source and detector NSI parameters, we marginalize over oscillation parameters and source and Detector NSI parameters $|\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}|$ and $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$. By comparing these two results, we explore the effect of NSIs on determination of δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23} by DUNE. For marginalization over NSI parameters, we consider the current uncertainty of these parameters.

To find out the effect of NSIs on δ_{CP}, since $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ affect the number of detected



FIG. 2. Number of events per bin for near and far detector of DUNE for three years of data taking in each mode. Number of events includes both signal and background. Oscillation parameters are taken from nu-fit [36, 37]. δ_{CP} is considered equal to zero. Detection efficiencies are taken from [34] and neutrino flux from [35]. All NSI parameters set to zero.

electron at the far detector, we explore the effect of these parameters to inducing the fake CP-violation phase (δ'_{CP}). We consider only one of these parameters are in order of 0.01 and their corresponding $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ are 0, 90, 180 and 270 degrees, and calculate numerically the value of fake CP-violation phase. Here we assume the value of δ_{CP} is zero. Then we consider the cases which all of these NSI parameters are nonzero.

As it is explained in section II, the near detector is only sensitive to $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^s_{\mu\mu}$, $\epsilon^s_{\mu\mu}$ and ϵ^s_{ee}. As mentioned before, since there are degeneracy between phases $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ and $|\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}|$, to constrain $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ by near and far detectors, for simplicity, we set the value of the phases equal to zero. To find constraint in each parameter, we fix all the other NSI parameters to zero. Since there are degeneracy between NSI parameters, if we do not fix the other NSI parameters, none of them can be constrained. The sensitivity of both near and far detectors

to $|\epsilon_{ee}|, |\epsilon_{e\mu}|, |\epsilon_{\mu e}|, |\epsilon_{\mu\mu}|, |\epsilon_{\mu\tau}|, |\epsilon_{\tau e}|$ and $|\epsilon_{\tau e}|$ are explored.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss our result about the effect of NSIs on determination of the standard parameters, δ_{CP} and θ_{23} and the constraints on source and detector NSI parameters from near and far detectors of DUNE.

A. Effects of NSIs on deamination of δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23} at DUNE

In Fig. 3, we show the potential of DUNE to determine the value of θ_{23} and δ_{CP}. To plot these figures we take the value and uncertainty of oscillation parameters from nu-fit [36, 37] and bounds with their upper and lower limits of NSI parameters are taken from [39]. We put all the values of NSI parameters equal to zero. Details of the DUNE are explained in section III B. In sub-figures a and b we marginalized over standard oscillation parameters and not NSI parameters. In sub-figures c and d, we marginalized over standard oscillation parameters and all the source and detector NSIs. In sub-figures a and c, we consider $\delta_{CP} = 0$ while in sub-figures b and d, we consider it is equal to 270 degrees. By comparing sub-figures a with c, and b with d, we find out considering the uncertainties of source and detector NSIs, have a significant effect on determination of the octant of θ_{23}. The octant of θ_{23} can be determined with 3σ C.L., when the uncertainty related to the source and detector NSI parameters is neglected, however, when these uncertainties are considered, octant cannot be determined with 3σ C.L. Also considering NSIs source and detector have important role on determination of CP-violation phase, which considering NSIs source and detector the accuracy of the δ_{CP} measurement by DUNE worsen twice.

As discussed in section II, ν_e appearance is sensitive to δ_{CP} and NSI parameters $|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|$, $|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|$ and $|\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|$. By considering $\delta_{CP} = 0$ and only one of these NSI parameters value is equal to 0.01 and their corresponding phases $\varphi^s_{\mu e}$, $\varphi^d_{\mu e}$ and $\varphi^d_{\tau e}$ equal to 0, 90, 180 and 270, we try to determine the magnitude of the induced fake CP-violation. The maximum of the induced fake CP phase will be less that ten degrees (the maximum eight degrees) and $\delta'_{CP} = 0$ will not be rule out at 1 σ C.L.

We further consider the value $|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|$, $|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|$ and $|\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|$ is nonzero and equal to 0.025 [19, 39] and we consider different values of 0, 90, 180 and 270 degrees for their corresponding phases. These results are shown in Fig. 4, sub-figures a, b and c. In some cases such as $\epsilon^d_{\mu e} = 0.025$ and $\phi^d_{\mu e} = 90^\circ$ or $\epsilon^d_{\tau e} = 0.025$ and $\phi^d_{\mu e} = 180^\circ$, the best fit point for fake CP phase δ' has more than 10° difference from zero. Then we consider all the parameters $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ equal to 0.025, and for their phases we consider the cases from 0, 90, 180 and 270 degrees, where the best point fit of δ' has the most deviation from zero when only one of the ϵ is considered non-zero. We consider the following cases: 1- $\phi^s_{\mu e} = 270^\circ$, $\phi^d_{\mu e} = 180^\circ$ and $\phi^d_{\tau e} = 90^\circ$, 2- $\phi^s_{\mu e} = 270^\circ$, $\phi^d_{\mu e} = 270^\circ$ and $\phi^d_{\tau e} = 90^\circ$, 3- $\phi^s_{\mu e} = 90^\circ$, $\phi^d_{\mu e} = 0^\circ$ and $\phi^d_{\tau e} = 180^\circ$ and 4- $\phi^s_{\mu e} = 90^\circ$, $\phi^d_{\mu e} = 0^\circ$ and $\phi^d_{\tau e} = 270^\circ$. The result is shown in sub-figure d of Fig. 4. In the third case the best point fit of δ' is 54 degrees and $\delta' = 0$ excluded more than 99%. Since we



FIG. 3. Determination of δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23} by DUNE after six years of data taking, three years in each mode, for $\delta_{CP} = 0°$ for sub-figures a and c and $\delta_{CP} = 270°$ for sub-figures b and d. In sub-figures a and b, we marginalized over standard oscillation parameters while in sub-figures c and d, we marginalized over standard [36, 37] and NSI source and detector parameters[39].

do not search all the acceptable values for source and detector NSI parameters and we find some conditions that δ' is not negligible and also $\delta' = 0$ can be excluded by more than 99%, therefore, it is reliable to conclude that the source and detector NSIs can have a significant impact on determining the value of CP-violation phase.

B. Sensitivities to source and detector NSIs at DUNE

In this section, we study the sensitivity of DUNE to the CC NSIs at the neutrinos source and detectors. We explore the prospects of the DUNE to constraint the NSI parameters using the one parameter-at-a-time fits and then extract the constraints at 90% C.L. For this



FIG. 4. Induced fake CP-violation phase δ'_{CP} in DUNE by considering non-zero source and detector NSIs. In sub-figures a, b and c only one of the NSI parameters $|\epsilon^s_{\mu e}|$, $|\epsilon^d_{\mu e}|$ and $|\epsilon^d_{\tau e}|$ is nonzero and its absolute value is equal to 0.025 and the values of corresponding NSIs phase are 0, 90, 180 and 270 degrees. In sub-figure d all of these NSI parameters are considered nonzero and equal to 0.025.

purpose we use all the neutrino and antineutrino oscillation channels relevant for DUNE at the both near and far detectors. The results of this study are demonstrated in Fig 5 and the bounds extracted at the 90% CL, are given in table I both for the case of near and far detectors. In table I, we also show the current bounds from the Ref. [39], which have been calculated indirectly. By the general comparison of bounds from this work with the bounds from Ref. [39] shows that DUNE with of running of time of 3+3 years has potential to give more stringent bounds than the existing ones from the other experiments [18, 19] and also the from the indirect bounds Ref. [39], as shown in the fourth column of table I. Interestingly, the bounds for the relevant parameters at the near detector has an over all an order of magnitude improvement than all of the current bounds, while using the data

of the far detector, the there is overall factor of 2 improvement except the $\epsilon^s_{\mu\tau}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}$ parameters which is loosely constrained in comparison to the current bounds at DUNE far detector.

As discussed in section II, the near detector is sensitive to $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$, $\epsilon^s_{\mu\mu}$, ϵ^d_{ee}, $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\mu\mu}$,, but not $\epsilon^s_{\mu\tau}$, $\epsilon^d_{e\mu}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}$, thus the former set of parameter can be constrained as shown in sub-Figs [a, b, d, f, g] while the later can not be constrained as shown in sub-Fig [c, e, h, i], at the near detector. The constraints on $\epsilon^s_{\mu\tau}$, $\epsilon^d_{e\mu}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}$, from the far detector are weaker than current bounds [39].

When we fixed δ_{CP} or θ_{23} to their central values and tried to find correlation between the NSIs parameters [$\epsilon^s_{\mu\tau}$, $\epsilon^d_{e\mu}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau e}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}$ and δ_{CP} or θ_{23}] and δ_{CP} or θ_{23}, we find that there is a strong correlation between $\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}$ and δ_{CP} and the constraint on the this parameter at 90%CL is 0.042. The same correlation, although weaker, also exists between $\epsilon^d_{e\mu}$ and δ_{CP} or θ_{23}. Similar correlation also exist between $\epsilon^s_{\mu\tau}$, $\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}$ with θ_{23}, where the bounds at the 90% CL are 0,013 and 0,014, respectively. This indicates that the parameters with weaker bounds are due the existing uncertainties in δ_{CP} and θ_{23}.

As a check we also repeated the exercise of the analysis in Fig. 3 using the bounds obtained from the study for the near detector case and found that there are marginal differences from the results of Fig. 3. The reason is the near detector cannot constrain the $\epsilon^s_{\tau e}$ parameter and as the previous section shows that this parameter is central to appearance channels and has a large impact on the measurement of δ_{CP} and octant of θ_{23}.

Notice, the near detector will constrain $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$. If these parameters have values O(0.01), their effect will be detectable in the near detector. Since the near detector is sensitive to such a values for $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$, thus the near detector can be slightly helpful to discriminate between fake CP-violation phase δ'_{CP} and δ_{CP}. In other words, if the fake CP violating phase is induced by $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$ or $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$, it can be recognizable from δ_{CP}, since the near detector is sensitive to $\epsilon^s_{\mu e}$ and $\epsilon^d_{\mu e}$. The near detector is not sensitive to $\epsilon^s_{\tau e}$ and thus it cannot discriminate between fake CP-violation phase δ'_{CP} and δ_{CP} in all the cases.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The main purposes of the planned neutrino oscillation experiments such as DUNE are determination of δ_{CP}, mass ordering and the octant of the atmospheric mixing angle, θ_{23}. The secondary goals of these experiments are the search for hints on new physics, such as nonstandard neutrino interactions, dark matter search, sterile neutrinos, large-extra dimensions, neutrino tridents etc [47, 48].

In this paper, we have explored the effects of CC NSIs at DUNE. We have studied the impacts on the simultaneous measurements of the δ_{CP} and θ_{23} due to the CC NSIs at neutrino source and at the detector. We study how the statistical significance level of the measurement of δ_{CP} and θ_{23} at the same time get affected by the NSIs inputs. We also check how the NSI parameters can induce a fake CP-violation (δ'_{CP}) effects, when the standard δ_{CP} is set to zero in the NSI model. Further, we find constraints on the CC NSIs at the source and detector for the simulated data at DUNE.

In section II, we give details of the effective four-Fermion Lagrangian for physics contain-



FIG. 5. Constraints on source and detector NSI parameters by near and far detector of DUNE. The experimental current bound at the 90% C.L. from [39] for each parameter shown by the black lines. The 90% C.L. are shown by dashed green lines.

ing both the standard and nonstandard effects at the neutrino source and at the detector. Then, we spell out all the details at the probability level relevant for DUNE. We have considered both the neutrino and antineutrino flavors with appearance and disappearance channels at both the near and at the far detectors of DUNE. We give details of our simulations for the DUNE setup and give information at the the event-rate level in section III. The results of the probability and event-rate analysis are given in figure 1 and figure 2, respectively.

We present the results of our analysis in section IV. The effects of source and detector NSIs on the simultaneous determination of δ_{CP} and θ_{23} are given in figure 3. For these results, we have marginalized over the NSI parameters as shown in sub-figures c and d while we did not marginalize over the NSIs parameters in sub-figures a and b. Our results demonstrate that in the absence of NSIs, the octant can be determined by 3σ C.L., while

parameter	Far Detector	Near detector	Current constraints
$\lvert\epsilon^s_{\mu e}\rvert$	0.016	0.013	0.026
$\lvert\epsilon^s_{\mu\mu}\rvert$	0.028	0.007	0.078
$\lvert\epsilon^s_{\mu\tau}\rvert$	0.074	-	0.013
$\lvert\epsilon^d_{ee}\rvert$	0.057	0.005	0.041
$\lvert\epsilon^d_{e\mu}\rvert$	0.049	-	0.026
$\lvert\epsilon^d_{\mu e}\rvert$	0.019	0.013	0.025
$\lvert\epsilon^d_{\mu\mu}\rvert$	0.032	0.007	0.078
$\lvert\epsilon^d_{\tau e}\rvert$	0.113	-	0.041
$\lvert\epsilon^d_{\tau\mu}\rvert$	0.076	-	0.013

TABLE I. One degree of freedom constraints on the CC NSI parameters at the near and far detector of DUNE, obtained from the Fig. 5 at 90%C.L., while the current indirect bounds from Ref. [39] at 90% C.L. also given in fourth row for comparison, The blank entries indicate the DUNE near detector has no sensitivity to such parameters.

with considering NSIs, the octant cannot be determined by 3σ C.L. Considering NSIs also affect determination of δ_{CP}, which worsen its determination by approximately a factor of two.

We also investigated the effect of NSIs to induce fake CP-violation phase δ'_{CP}. Our results are shown in Fig. 4 which shows that in some cases δ'_{CP} can be large ($\delta'_{CP} \sim 60^\circ$), and $\delta'_{CP} \sim 0^\circ$ can be excluded by more than 99% C.L. With these results, we can conclude that the effect of source and detector NSIs is important in determining δ_{CP} and NSIs can induce large amount of fake CP-violation. Measurement of δ_{CP} with experiments with other process of producing neutrino such as production of neutrino from muon decay and also detection of the neutrino with other process can help to distinguish this induced fake CP phase from the true one. Moreover, the near detector of DUNE and also other future experiments which have the same process for production and/or detection of the neutrinos, can help to constrain the source and detector NSIs and distinguish between δ'_{CP} from δ_{CP}.

The results on constraining all of the relevant NSI parameters in this study at the near and far detectors data of DUNE are displayed in Fig. 5. The related bounds obtained from the one parameter-at-a-time fits of Fig. 5 are given in Table I, The results show that DUNE near detector has a stronger potential to constrain the CC NSIs more tightly, better than one order of magnitude in comparison to the existing bounds on these NSI parameters, The bounds obtained from the simulated data of the far detector are, although weaker, than the near detector bounds, however they are a factor of 2 more stronger than the existing bounds.

Acknowledgments

Authors are grateful for Y. Farzan and D. McKay for useful comments and careful reading of the manuscript. P.B. acknowledges partial support from the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 674896 and No. 690575. A. K. work has been financially supported by the Sun Yat-Sen University under the Post-Doctoral Fellowship program.

---

[1] K. Abe *et al.* [T2K Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** (2011) 041801 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.041801 [arXiv:1106.2822 [hep-ex]].

[2] Y. Abe *et al.* (Double Chooz Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 131801 (2012); Phys. Rev. D **86**, 052008 (2012).

[3] J. K. Ahn *et al.* (RENO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 191802 (2012).

[4] F. An *et al.* (Daya Bay Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012); Chin. Phys. C 37, 011001(2013).

[5] Y.-F. Li, "Overview of the Jiangmen Underground Neutrino Detector (JUNO), arXiv:1402.6143v1 [physics.ins-det] (2014).

[6] S. Seo, Introduction to RENO-50, in Proceedings of the International Workshop on RENO-50: Toward Neutrino Mass Hierarchy, Seoul, 2013.

[7] K. Abe *et al.* [T2K Collaboration], PTEP **2015** (2015) no.4, 043C01 doi:10.1093/ptep/ptv031 [arXiv:1409.7469 [hep-ex]].

[8] P. Adamson *et al.* [NOvA Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.5, 051104 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.051104 [arXiv:1601.05037 [hep-ex]].

[9] K. Abe *et al.* [Hyper-Kamiokande Proto- Collaboration], PTEP **2015** (2015) 053C02 doi:10.1093/ptep/ptv061 [arXiv:1502.05199 [hep-ex]].

[10] R. Acciarri *et al.* [DUNE Collaboration], arXiv:1512.06148 [physics.ins-det]; C. Adams *et al.* [LBNE Collaboration], arXiv:1307.7335 [hep-ex],

[11] H. Minakata and S. J. Parke, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) no.11, 113005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.113005 [arXiv:1303.6178 [hep-ph]].

[12] K. Abe et al., arXiv:1109.3262.

[13] C. Adams et al. (LBNE Collaboration), arXiv:1307.7335

[14] IDS-NF Collaboration, International Design Study for a Neutrino Factory, https://www.ids-nf.org/wiki/FrontPage.

[15] E. Baussan et al. (ESSnuSB Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. B885, 127 (2014).

[16] P. Coloma, H. Minakata and S. J. Parke, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) 093003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.093003 [arXiv:1406.2551 [hep-ph]].

[17] A. N. Khan, D. W. McKay and F. Tahir, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 113006 (2013), arXiv:1305.4350 [hep-ph].

[18] A. N. Khan, D. W. McKay and F. Tahir, Phys.Rev. D **90**, 053008 (2014), arXiv:1407.4263 [hep-ph].

[19] A. N. Khan, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.9, 093019 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.093019 [arXiv:1605.09284 [hep-ph]].
[20] I. Girardi, D. Meloni and S. T. Petcov, Nucl. Phys. B **886** (2014) 31 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2014.06.014 [arXiv:1405.0416 [hep-ph]].
[21] I. Girardi and D. Meloni, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) no.7, 073011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.073011 [arXiv:1403.5507 [hep-ph]].
[22] A. de Gouva and K. J. Kelly, Nucl. Phys. B **908** (2016) 318 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2016.03.013 [arXiv:1511.05562 [hep-ph]].
[23] J. Liao, D. Marfatia and K. Whisnant, arXiv:1601.00927 [hep-ph].
[24] P. Coloma, JHEP **1603**, 016 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2016)016 [arXiv:1511.06357 [hep-ph]].
[25] P. Coloma and T. Schwetz, arXiv:1604.05772 [hep-ph].
[26] P. Bakhti and Y. Farzan, arXiv:1602.07099 [hep-ph].
[27] J. Cao *et al.*, Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams **17** (2014) 090101 doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTAB.17.090101 [arXiv:1401.8125 [physics.acc-ph]].
[28] T. Ohlsson, Rept. Prog. Phys. **76** (2013) 044201 doi:10.1088/0034-4885/76/4/044201 [arXiv:1209.2710 [hep-ph]].
[29] M. Blennow, S. Choubey, T. Ohlsson and S. K. Raut, JHEP **1509** (2015) 096 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2015)096 [arXiv:1507.02868 [hep-ph]].
[30] Y. Farzan and I. M. Shoemaker, arXiv:1512.09147 [hep-ph].
[31] Y. Farzan, Phys. Lett. B **748** (2015) 311 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.015 [arXiv:1505.06906 [hep-ph]].
[32] J. Kopp, M. Lindner, T. Ota and J. Sato, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 013007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.013007 [arXiv:0708.0152 [hep-ph]].
[33] S. E. Kopp, Phys. Rept. **439** (2007) 101 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2006.11.004 [physics/0609129].
[34] C. Adams *et al.* [LBNE Collaboration], arXiv:1307.7335 [hep-ex].
[35] http://home.fnal.gov/∼ljf26/DUNE2015CDRFluxes/
[36] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, J. Salvado and T. Schwetz, JHEP **1212**, 123 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)123 [arXiv:1209.3023 [hep-ph]].
[37] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, JHEP **1411**, 052 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2014)052 [arXiv:1409.5439 [hep-ph]].
[38] S. Choubey and D. Pramanik, arXiv:1604.04731 [hep-ph].
[39] C. Biggio, M. Blennow and E. Fernandez-Martinez, JHEP **0908**, 090 (2009) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/08/090 [arXiv:0907.0097 [hep-ph]].
[40] P. Bakhti and Y. Farzan, JHEP **1407**, 064 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)064 [arXiv:1403.0744 [hep-ph]].
[41] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors **25** (1981) 297; R. J. Geller and T. Hara, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **503** (2003) 187 doi:10.1016/S0168-9002(03)00670-3 [hep-ph/0111342].
[42] P. Huber, M. Lindner and W. Winter, Comput. Phys. Commun. **167** (2005) 195 doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2005.01.003 [hep-ph/0407333].

[43] P. Huber, J. Kopp, M. Lindner, M. Rolinec and W. Winter, Comput. Phys. Commun. **177** (2007) 432 doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2007.05.004 [hep-ph/0701187].

[44] J. Kopp, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **19** (2008) 523 doi:10.1142/S0129183108012303 [physics/0610206].

[45] M. D. Messier, UMI-99-23965.

[46] E. A. Paschos and J. Y. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 033002 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.033002 [hep-ph/0107261].

[47] R. Acciarri *et al.* [DUNE Collaboration], arXiv:1601.05471 [physics.ins-det].

[48] J. M. Berryman, A. de Gouva, K. J. Kelly and A. Kobach, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.7, 073012 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.073012 [arXiv:1507.03986 [hep-ph]].